

REMARKS

A. The Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,812,953 to Griffith et al. (hereinafter, "Griffith") in view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,647,260 to Dusse et al. (hereinafter, "Dusse"). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Of the rejected claims, claims 1 and 17 are independent. It is to these claims that the Applicants direct their remarks, it being understood that the remarks apply to the remaining dependent claims as well.

Independent claims 1 and 17 include, among other features, displaying settings of a separate wireless device within a web page. Neither Griffith nor Dusse, separately or in combination, appear to disclose this feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to acknowledge that Griffith does not disclose or suggest this feature. To make up for this deficiency the Examiner appears to rely upon Dusse.

However, there is no mention of displaying settings of a separate wireless device within a web page in Dusse.

Dusse appears to be generally directed to a system and method of provisioning a two-way mobile communications device (Figures 1 and 2). The device exchanges information with a remote server via an "airnet **104**" and a "landnet **118**" (also indicated as "landnet **450**" -- see Figs 1 and 4), where the landnet may be the Internet. Further, Dusse mentions in passing that the

landnet may use HTTP or sHTTP communications protocol (*see* col. 4 ln 38-43). Dusse, however, does not disclose or suggest that settings of the two-way mobile communications device are displayed within a web page.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the use of the HTTP or sHTTP protocol in a landnet does not necessarily mean that Dusse contemplates displaying the settings of a separate wireless device within a web page. Proof of this is Dusse's complete silence regarding such a feature.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants believe that the subject matter of claims 1-4, 6-20 and 22-32 (claims 5 and 21 have been canceled) would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention based on the combined disclosure of Griffith and Dusse.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-20 and 22-32.

* * *

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC.

By: /John E. Curtin/
John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 1995
Vienna, Virginia 22183
(703) 266-3330